BY MESSRS. M. C. LINGEGOWDA AND S. C. MALLIAH,—
(Mandya Rural).

Q.—20. Will the Government be pleased :—

(*a*) To state what is the number of original capital works costing over Rs. 10,000, chiefly tanks and buildings, taken up by the P.W.D. during the last 15 years.

(*b*) To furnish a list showing the expenditure incurred on each work?

(*c*) To state the loss sustained by Government in abandoning the works after half or three-fourths of the estimated cost has been worked out, and what is the loss due to deterioration of work already turned out more particularly in respect of the (1) Marlvadi project, (2) Nidasale tank, (3) Hairige tank and (4) Bhrugu channel projects?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—

A.—20. (*a*) and (*b*) Copies of lists received from the Executive Engineers are herewith attached. (*Vide* Appendix V).

(*c*) None of the works are abandoned.

(1) and (2) Both these works were ordered in 1921 to be temporarily stopped as no adequate allotments could be made on account of financial stringency.

(3) This is a work in progress but no provision could be made during the last and current years. For the work to be pushed on more vigorously so as to complete the same in 4 years, grant of Rs. 21,000 was applied for but this could not be sanctioned on account of the limited grant placed at the disposal of the Public Works Department. Again Rs. 20,000 has been applied for for the current official year as no substantial work can be carried out with anything less than this amount.

(4) The work is under progress and a sum of Rs. 12,000 has been provided in the current year's Budget. Water was let into the channel for the first 10 miles for irrigating the wet lands below it.

Supplementary Questions.

Mr. M. C. Lingegowda.—

The Hairige tank has not been taken up for restoration for a number of years. Will the Government be pleased to state if it is possible to take up this tank this year?

Dewan.—

That is not a supplemental question and cannot be answered now.

Mr. B. Srinivasiengar of Anekal.—

With reference to item No. 75 in Appendix V (of replies to Interpellations), will the Government be pleased to state whether any new cutcherry was constructed at all ?

Dewan.—

It ought to be repairs and additions to the old cutcherry. It is now reported that the amount represents the cost of constructing a new taluk cutcherry the estimate for which was sanctioned but has not been operated upon.

A Member.—

The Nidasala tank :—The figure, Rs. 6,668, shown against Nidasala tank is not correct, as any body who has seen the work done on the tank will admit that work costing much more than the sum has been done.

Dewan.—

There seems to be a mistake here and the matter will be enquired nto.

It is now seen that it is a mistake in printing and the figure should be Rs. 66,606.

By Messrs. M. C. Lingegowda and S. C. Mallíah,— (Mandya Rural).

Q.—21. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) What is the amount of bid by Mr. Ranga Rao, Excise Contractor, in the Excise sale of Hunsur and Gundlupet Taluks for 1923-24 ?

(*b*) Whether he furnished any amount as deposit in accordance with the rules when he was declared the highest bidder ?

(*c*) What was the amount lost by Government on account of resale ?

(*d*) Whether it will not be in accordance with the rules to recover the amount so lost, from the officer responsible for this neglect ?

Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.—

			Rs.
A.—21. (*a*) 1. Hunsur Taluk	Monthly rental		3,171
2. Gundlupet Taluk	Do	....	2,732